JW

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,425	07/28/2001	Michael S. Allison	10018218-1	4633

22879	7590	04/14/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td colspan="2">Application No.
09/918,425</td><td>Applicant(s)
ALLISON ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Examiner
Laurie Ries</td><td>Art Unit
2176</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*17 December 2004*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-20*</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-6,8-18 and 20*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>*7 and 19*</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 17 December 2004, to the original application, filed 28 July 2001.

The rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 101 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claims 1-3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503).

Claims 4 and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503)in view of Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1).

Claim 5 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1) and further in view of Marso (U.S. Publication 2002/0078349 A1).

Claims 8 and 9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688 A1).

Claims 10-12 and 14-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1).

Claim 13 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) and further in view of Ciccone (U.S. Patent 6,338,149 B1).

Claim 18 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) and further in view of Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1).

Claim 20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Hansen and further in view of Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688 A1).

The rejection of claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinman

(U.S. Patent 5,724,503).

As per claim 1, Kleinman discloses a method for analyzing text strings which are

associated with events from electronic architecture having one or more entities

generating the events, including processing the text strings (See Kleinman, Column 6,

lines 45-67) and transforming the text strings to human interpretable statements

summarizing at least one of the events associated with the text strings (See Kleinman,

Column 6, lines 60-65).

As per claim 2, Kleinman discloses transforming the text strings to an English

statement setting forth one or more of problems and system health of the architecture.

(See Kleinman, Column 6, lines 60-67).

As per claim 3, Kleinman discloses processing the text strings according to one

of the entities associated with the text string. (See Kleinman, Column 6, lines 45-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of

Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1).

As per claim 4, Kleinman discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above.

Kleinman does not disclose expressly processing text strings representative of one or

more chassis code of the one entity. Bouchier discloses displaying chassis codes

related to a number of partitions of a computer system. (See Bouchier, Column 12,

lines 1-9). Kleinman and Bouchier are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of managing operations of electronic system architecture. At the time

of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine the chassis codes of Bouchier with the step of processing text strings of

Kleinman. The motivation for doing so would have been to collect and process the data

that would alert the user to problems within the system. (See Bouchier, Column 11,

lines 46-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bouchier with Kleinman

for the benefit of identifying system errors to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

As per claim 6, Kleinman and Bouchier disclose the limitations of claim 4 as

described above. Bouchier also discloses processing problem detail of the chassis

codes. (See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50). Kleinman and Bouchier are analogous

art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing operations of

electronic system architecture. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the problem detail of Bouchier with the

processing of chassis codes of Kleinman and Bouchier. The motivation for doing so

would have been to collect and process the data specific to problems within the system.

(See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Bouchier with Kleinman for the benefit of further identifying system errors to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman

(U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1) as applied to claim 4

above, and further in view of Marso (U.S. Publication 2002/0078349 A1).

As per claim 5, Kleinman and Bouchier disclose the limitations of claim 4 as

described above. Kleinman and Bouchier do not disclose expressly the steps of parsing

the chassis codes and sequentially processing each of the chassis codes. Marso

discloses that text messages may be parsed sequentially. (See Marso, Page 5,

paragraph 0052). Kleinman, Bouchier and Marso are analogous art because they are

from the same field of endeavor of processing text messages and statements. At the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine the processing of chassis codes of Kleinman and Bouchier with the sequential

parsing of Marso. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow full

understanding of the message content by processing the message in a sequential

order. (See Marso, Page 5, paragraph 0052). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Marso with Kleinman and Bouchier for the benefit of improved understanding

of the text message content to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688 A1).

As per claim 8, Kleinman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above:

Kleinman does not disclose expressly printing the statement. Bice discloses that

notification messages can be sent via page or facsimile, both of which would be printed

material. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048). Kleinman and Bice are analogous art

because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing text messages and

statements. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine the transforming of text strings into a human

interpretable statement of Kleinman with the printing of the statement of Bice. The

motivation for doing so would have been to notify the customer of the occurrence of an

event. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Bice with Kleinman for the benefit of alerting a user to the contents of the

statement to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

As per claim 9, Kleinman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above.

Kleinman does not disclose expressly emailing at least part of the statement to an email

destination. Bice discloses that notification messages can be sent via email

automatically. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048). Kleinman and Bice are analogous

art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing text messages and

statements. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine the transforming of text strings into a human

interpretable statement of Kleinman with the emailing of the statement of Bice. The

motivation for doing so would have been to notify the customer of the occurrence of an

event. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Bice with Kleinman for the benefit of alerting a user to the contents of the

statement to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Claims 10-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) as applied to claim 1 above, and

further in view of Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1).

As per claim 10, Kleinman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described

above. Kleinman does not disclose expressly the step of acquiring the text strings from

an extraction tool coupled to the architecture. Hansen discloses extracting the event lot

using a feature extractor module that is coupled to the architecture. (See Hansen, Page

6, paragraph 0057). Kleinman and Hansen are analogous art because they are from

the same field of endeavor of interpreting and processing system events. At the time of

the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine the extraction tool of Hansen with the text string processing method of

Kleinman. The motivation for doing so would have been to produce a reduced data set

event log and thereby streamline the process of interpreting the events. (See Hansen,

Page 1, paragraphs 0009 and 0012). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Hansen with Kleinman for the benefit of improved reading and understanding

of events contained in the text string statement to obtain the invention as specified in

claim 10.

As per claims 11 and 17, Kleinman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Kleinman does not disclose expressly extracting the events from the

architecture, separating the events according to the entities, and transforming the

events to one or more text strings. Hansen discloses extracting the events from the

system, separating the events according to the proper examination record, and

transforming the events into text strings called EXAMs. (See Hansen, Page 6,

paragraph 0057). Kleinman and Hansen are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor of interpreting and processing system events. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine

the extraction process of Hansen with the text string processing method of Kleinman.

The motivation for doing so would have been to produce a reduced data set event log

and thereby streamline the process of interpreting the events. (See Hansen, Page 1,

paragraphs 0009 and 0012). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Hansen with Kleinman for the benefit of improved reading and understanding of events

contained in the text string statement to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11

and 17.

As per claim 12, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Hansen also discloses accessing one or more analyzers that are part of the feature extractor module. (See Hansen, page 7, claim 4). Kleinman and Hansen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of interpreting and processing system events. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the analyzers of Hansen with the extraction process of Kleinman and Hansen. The motivation for doing so would have been to interpret the events extracted by the feature extractor module. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Kleinman for the benefit of interpreting and analyzing the events to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

As per claim 14, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Hansen also discloses that the analyzers process text strings associated with one of the entities. (See Hansen, Page 7, claim 10). Kleinman and Hansen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of interpreting and processing system events. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the analyzing of text strings associated with events of Hansen with the extraction process of Kleinman and Hansen. The motivation for doing so would have been to interpret the events extracted by the feature extractor module. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Kleinman for the benefit of interpreting and analyzing the events to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Claim 15 is rejected on the same basis as claims 11,12, and 14.

As per claim 16, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 15 as

described above. Hansen also discloses that the system includes a software routine,

which is included in the list of possible entities set forth in claim 16. (See Hansen, Page

2, paragraph 0028). Kleinman and Hansen are analogous art because they are from

the same field of endeavor of interpreting and processing system events. At the time of

the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include

the software routine of Hansen with the system entities of Kleinman and Hansen. The

motivation for doing so would have been to implement the disclosed technique of

analyzing system events. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0028). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine Hansen with Kleinman for the benefit of implementing

the methods as disclosed in claim 15 to obtain the invention specified in claim 16.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) as

applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Ciccone (U.S. Patent 6,338,149 B1).

As per claim 13, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 12 as

described above. Kleinman and Hansen do not disclose expressly utilizing a graphical

user interface coupled to one or more of the analyzers. Ciccone discloses the use of a

graphical user interface coupled to a system that is used to display information. (See

Ciccone, Column 14, lines 53-67, and Column 15, lines 1-15). Kleinman, Hansen, and

Ciccone are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

interpreting and monitoring system events. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the graphical user

interface of Ciccone with the system analyzers of Kleinman and Hansen. The

motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user or system administrator to

specify various options via a menu on the graphical user interface to change or limit the

data displayed. (See Ciccone, Column 10, lines 29-43). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Ciccone with Kleinman and Hansen for the benefit of improving the

display options of the system data available to the user to obtain the invention as

specified in claim 13.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) as

applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1).

As per claim 18, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 15 as

described above. Kleinman and Hansen do not disclose expressly that the text strings

include problem detail and chassis code. Bouchier also discloses processing problem

detail of chassis codes. (See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50). Kleinman, Hansen,

and Bouchier are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

managing operations of electronic system architecture. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the problem

detail and chassis codes of Bouchier with the text strings of Kleinman and Hansen. The

motivation for doing so would have been to collect and process the data specific to

problems within the system. (See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Bouchier with Kleinman and Hansen for the

benefit of further identifying system errors to obtain the invention as specified in claim

18.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) as

applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688

A1).

As per claim 20, Kleinman and Hansen disclose the limitations of claim 15 as

described above. Kleinman and Hansen do not disclose expressly publishing the

statement in one or more of computer memory, paper form, and email. `Bice discloses

that notification messages can be published via email, which is included in the list of

possible publishing methods set forth in claim 20. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048).

Kleinman, Hansen, and Bice are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of processing text messages and statements. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system

of Kleinman and Hansen with the emailing of the statement of Bice. The motivation for

doing so would have been to notify the customer of the occurrence of an event. (See

Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bice

with Kleinman and Hansen for the benefit of alerting a user to the contents of the

statement to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 17 December 2004 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "events" limited to "chassis logs that are specific to boot-up and operation of the

electronic architecture", as stated by Applicant on Page 7) are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With regard to claim 1, Kleinman discloses automatically processing text strings. This process is "automatic" in that it is performed without user intervention. "Processing" involves storing the exception text at the client machine by requiring the server to send a unique identifier. "Text strings" are disclosed in the process of Kleinman as a string of text representing a system exception message. Kleinman discloses transforming the text string to a human interpretable statement (e.g. English, See Kleinman, Column 6, line 63) to provide an explanation that can be displayed to and understood by a user. Compare with Claim1, which recites a method for analyzing events from electronic architecture by automatically processing text strings associated with the events and transforming the text strings to human interpretable statements summarizing at least one of the events.

With regard to claim 2, the exception, as disclosed by Kleinman, refers to an anomaly in the processing of an event or method which could result in an error (See Kleinman, Column 2, lines 36-40). This is equivalent to a "problem" as recited in Claim 2 of the instant application.

With regard to claim 3, the "entities associated with the text string" as recited in claim 3 are represented by Kleinman by exception tags (See Kleinman, Column 6, lines 59-60). Note that an "entity" is interpreted to mean "an item that can be treated as a unit and, often, as a member of a particular category or type" (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Page 178).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

With regard to claims 4 and 6, the motivation to combine would have been to collect and process the data, which would alert the user to problems within the system. (See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50).

With regard to claim 5, the motivation to combine would have been to allow full understanding of the message content by processing the message in a sequential order. (See Marso, Page 5, paragraph 0052).

With regard to claims 8 and 9, the motivation to combine would have been to notify the customer of the occurrence of an event. (See Bice, Page 5, paragraph 0048).

With regard to claim 10, the motivation to combine would have been to produce a reduced data set event log and thereby streamline the process of interpreting the events. (See Hansen, Page 1, paragraphs 0009 and 0012).

With regard to claims 11, 15, and 17, the motivation to combine would have been to produce a reduced data set event log and thereby streamline the process of interpreting the events. (See Hansen, Page 1, paragraphs 0009 and 0012).

With regard to claim 12, the motivation to combine would have been to interpret the events extracted by the feature extractor module. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0016).

With regard to claim 14, the motivation to combine would have been to interpret the events extracted by the feature extractor module. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0016).

With regard to claim 16, the motivation to combine would have been to been to implement the disclosed technique of analyzing system events. (See Hansen, Page 2, paragraph 0028).

With regard to claim 18, the motivation to combine would have been to collect and process the data specific to problems within the system. (See Bouchier, Column 11, lines 46-50).

With regard to claim 20, and in response to applicant's argument that Bice is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kleinman, Hansen, and Bice are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing text messages and statements.

With regard to claim 13, and in response to applicant's argument that Ciccone is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kleinman, Hansen, and Ciccone are analogous art

because they are from the same field of endeavor of interpreting and monitoring system

events.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER